



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,154	02/13/2004	Krishna V. Kotipalli	306213.01	5107
22971 7590 04/14/2010 MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399				
EXAMINER				
HE, JIALONG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2626				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/14/2010		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ntovar@microsoft.com

p5docket@microsoft.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/777,154

**Applicant(s)**

KOTIPALI, KRISHNA V.

**Examiner**

JIALONG HE

**Art Unit**

2626

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 February 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8-10, 25, 28, 29 and 32-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 36-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 8-10, 25, 28-29, 32-35 and 43-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

***Response to Amendments***

2. The applicant filed a response on 02/26/2010 by adding new claims 32-44. New independent claim 36 and dependent claims 37-42 are directed to inventions that are distinct from previously presented invention. A restriction under 35 U.S.C. 121 is required.

***Election/Restrictions***

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Previous presented claims 6, 8-10, 25, 28-29, new claims 32-35 and 43-44, drawn to mapping a text string in a first alphabet to a text string to in third alphabet using a second alphabet set, classified in class 704, subclass 8.
  - II. New claims 36-42, drawn to determining if a mapping scheme between a first alphabet and a second alphabet exists, if not, creating a mapping scheme, classified in class 704, subclass 3.

***Election by Original Presentation***

4. Groups I and II are related as being subcombinations usable together in a disclosed combination. They do not overlap in scope, and have separate utility outside

of the combination. Group II is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed (Group I) for one or more following reasons:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention (Group I) has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, new claims 36-42 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons.

In the amended independent claim 6 and also in the new independent claim 43, the applicant adds a negative limitation: "wherein receiving the text string does not comprise receiving a selection of previously entered text" and to distinguish the claimed invention with the reference to Janakiraman (US Pat. 7,369,986). The applicant argues (Remarks, pages 11-12) that Janakiraman selects text by "click" for transliteration and does not provide "text string is received on the input" and the user does not "textually" enter the phrase to be translated.

In response, the Examiner notes that nowhere in the original disclosure mentions about receiving text could be done by selection or not selection. Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims. See *In re Johnson*, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977). Any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. See following rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.

The Examiner further notes during the patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." >The Federal Circuit's en banc decision in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 75 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Janakiraman disclosure about selecting text on the screen for transliteration using a computer mouse reads on the claim limitation: "receiving text string in a first alphabet on an input of the computing device".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 6, 8-10, 25, 28-29, 32-35 and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The applicant adds a negative limitation "wherein receiving the text string does not comprise receiving a selection of previously entered text" in the amended independent claim 6 and new independent claim 43 to distinguish the claimed invention with the cited reference. The Examiner could not find support from the original

disclosure for the negative limitation. MPEP (2163.06) states applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. The applicant has not pointed out where the new (or amended) claim is supported. Any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Dependent claims 8-10, 25, 28-29, 32-35 and 44 include all limitations of their corresponding independent claim 1 and 44. Therefore, these dependent claims are rejected.

Amended claim 8, which depends on claim 6, recites "wherein the first alphabet is a western alphabet and the third alphabet is an indic alphabet". However, based on the disclosure (specification, paragraph [46] and fig. 10), it appears the invention is mapping from one indic language (e.g. Hindi, first alphabet) to another indic language (e.g., Telugu, third alphabet) through English (western alphabet, second alphabet). There is no support for the amended claim 8.

New claims 34 and 44 recite a negative limitation: "the text string in the first alphabet is not displayed to the user on the output device". The applicant has not pointed out where the new (or amended) claim is supported. The Examiner could not find support from the original disclosure for the negative limitation.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. Claim 6, 8-10, 25, 28-29, 32, 33, 35 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al (US Pat. 7,369,986, previously cited, hereinafter referred to as Janakiraman) in view of Bruso et al. (US Pat. 5,649,214, previously cited, hereinafter referred to as Bruso).

Regarding claims 6 and 43, Janakiraman discloses a computer implemented method for transliterating languages in a computing device comprising:

receiving a text string in a first alphabet on an input of the computing device, wherein the text string is input on the input by a user (**col. 7, col. 7, lines 10-25, Fig. 4A-4E, receiving typed messages from a keyboard, fig. 5A, Tamil version, fig. 5C, English version**);

converting the text string in the first alphabet to a phonetic string in a third alphabet based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the third alphabet, the third alphabet different than the first alphabet (**col. 6, lines 7-20, fig. 4A –fig 4E, transliteration Tamil language Governor to “aaLuunjar”**);

displaying the phonetic string in the third alphabet to the user on an output device (**fig. 4A-4E**); and



transmitting the phonetic string in the third alphabet to a remote processing device (**fig. 1, #104 server**).

Janakiraman discloses using English characters to represent various languages used in India by transliteration (**title and Abstract**). Janakiraman does not disclose transliteration through an intermediary language.

Bruso discloses converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet (**Bruso, col. 2, col. 2, lines 43-67, mapping the intermediated coded character set to ISO 8859 character set** (a third alphabet of a second language), **also fig. 3A and 3B**).

Janakiraman and Bruso are analogous art and from a similar field of applicant's endeavor in transliteration. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Janakiraman's teaching with Bruso's teaching to transliterate a language to another language through an intermediary language. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a modification because the documents are still available during transliteration procedure (**Bruso, col. 2, lines 33-46**).

Regarding claim 8, the combined teaching of Janakiraman and Brusco further discloses the first alphabet is a western language and the third alphabet is an Indic language (**Fig. 4C, English, Fig. 5A, Tamil, also fig. 4A**).

Regarding claim 9, Janakiraman further discloses the first alphabet is an Indic language and the third alphabet is another Indic language (**col. 1, lines 45-55, transliterating a selected word to a target language, col. 1, lines 14-20, target languages could be Hindi, Sanskrit, Urdu and all 18 India official languages**).

Regarding claims 10 and 20, Janakiraman further discloses displaying the converted text string in the third alphabet on an output device (**fig. 4A- fig. 4E**).

Regarding claim 25, Janakiraman further discloses transmitting the phonetic string in the third alphabet to a remote processing device (**fig. 1, network, fig. 2, server, fig. 4A-4B, web browser**).

Regarding claim 28, Janakiraman further discloses the phonetic string in the third alphabet contains at least one character that is not present in the text string in the first alphabet **col. 6, lines 10-20, fig. 4A, Tamil writing and English language using different characters**).

Regarding claim 29, the combined teaching of Janakiraman and Bruso further discloses the phonetic string in the third alphabet contains at least one character that is not present in the phonetic string in the second alphabet (**Janakiraman, col. 1, lines 12-40, different Indian languages and English use different characters; Bruso, fig. 3, German language use Umlaut characters**).

Regarding claim 32, Janakiraman further discloses wherein the input is a keyboard that is configured to receive the text string in the first alphabet from a user (**fig. 3, #320**).

Regarding claim 33, Janakiraman further discloses displaying the phonetic string in the third alphabet to the user on an output device (**fig. 4, 4A-4E**).

Regarding claim 35, Janakiraman further discloses there is no predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the third alphabet (**col. 1, lines 12-42, no mapping between many different indic languages such as between Hinid and Sanskrit**).

### ***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JIALONG HE whose telephone number is (571)270-5359. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00 - 4:30, Alt Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JH/

/Richmond Dorvil/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626